



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,919	08/04/2003	Potapov Sergey	Q75814	4930
23373	7590	07/17/2006	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			KERNS, KEVIN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1725	

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding..

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/632,919

Applicant(s)

SERGEY ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin P. Kerns

Art Unit

1725

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: 11-13.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-4, 6-10, 17, 21, 23 and 25-27.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 14-16, 19, 20, 22 and 24.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Kevin P. Kerns *Kevin Kerns 7/11/06*
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1725

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the applicants' response after final, which was received by the USPTO on July 5, 2006, remains unpersuasive in view of sections 3, 6, and 9 of the final rejection mailed April 21, 2006. With regard to the applicants' remarks on pages 2 and 3 of the response, the examiner continues to respectfully disagree with the applicants' assertion of patentability of the limitation "approximately at room temperature", due to the optional heating and/or heating of a small localized area on the elements to be bonded (see Dautartas et al.; and sections 3 and 9 of the final rejection). Under these conditions (no heating or small localized heating), at least the adjacent regions in the method are necessarily at "approximately room temperature". As a result, independent claims 1 and 17 (and claims dependent therefrom) remain rejected by Dautartas et al. under 35 USC 102(e). It is noted that the applicants have not provided any further arguments for independent claim 4, such that the arguments provided in section 9 of the final rejection continue to apply. Regarding the Ainslie et al. reference, the combination with Dautartas et al. under 35 USC 103(a) is proper in rejecting claims 21 and 23, as UV light has advantages of applying an appropriate amount of heat energy to bond the elements (see sections 6 and 9 of the final rejection). The applicants' remarks in the last two paragraphs of page 3 of the remarks generally attack the references individually, without considering the advantages of UV light in the related bonding methods. It is noted that claims 11-13 remain allowed, but with all remaining claims being rejected or withdrawn from consideration (see section 1 of the final rejection regarding appropriate action to be taken regarding the withdrawn, non-elected claims).

KEVIN KERNS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Kevin Kerns 7/11/06